

**D. AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS**

There are no amendments to the drawings.

**E. REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

This Response is filed in response to an Office Action dated April 18, 2006.

Upon entry of this response claims 1-17 and 28-30 will be pending in the application.

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-17 and 28-30 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

It is Applicant's intent to place the present application in condition for allowance. To this end, Applicant has fully addressed the Examiner's rejections as set forth in the Office Action dated April 18, 2006.

Applicant amended claims 1 and 28-29 to correct informalities in the claims. No new matter was added by virtue of these amendments.

**Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

The Examiner rejected claims 1-17 and 28-30 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the Examiner noted:

In claim 1, the preamble states forming diffusion aluminide coatings "on an uncoated surface of a substrate". However, the first step requires providing a metal substrate comprising an external surface and an internal passage wherein the "external surface of the substrate being coated with a coating layer". The limitations appear to contradict each other and it is not clear whether the substrate is coated or not prior to cleansing and the aluminum vapor deposition. This issue applies to claims 28-29 as well.

This issue appears to be critical because applicant argues this very issue on p.12 of the response dated 1/30/06.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 1-17 and 28-30 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

In response, independent claims 1 and 28-29 have been amended in a manner believed to overcome the Examiner's rejection. The respective preambles of each of claims 1 and 28-29 have been amended to recite "A process for forming diffusion aluminide coatings on an uncoated portion of a surface of a substrate." In addition, the first step is clarified to recite "at least a portion of the internal surface being uncoated." By virtue of this amendment, it is believed that the preamble and limitations recited in the first step do not contradict each other, as the first step involves a metal substrate that is not completely coated on an internal surface, thus allowing an amount of the substrate surface to be uncoated prior to the cleaning step.

Therefore, in view of the above, Applicant submits that claims 1-17 and 28-30 are not indefinite and comply with the provisions of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, and therefore are allowable.

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the outstanding rejection. As a result of the amendments and arguments provided above, claims 1-17 and 28-30 are thus in condition for allowance. Applicant requests allowance of claims 1-17 and 28-30 in a timely manner. Applicant submits that no new matter has been added by the amendments to the claims. If the Examiner believes that prosecution of this Application could be expedited by a telephone conference, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the Applicant. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-17 and 28-30 are not anticipated or rendered obvious by Wheat and/or Das.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge indicated fees and credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-1059.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 26, 2006

/K. Scott O'Brian/  
K. Scott O'Brian  
Reg. No. 42,946  
McNEES WALLACE & NURICK LLC  
100 Pine Street  
P.O. Box 1166  
Harrisburg, PA 17108-1166  
(717) 237-5492